





DATE MAILED: 01/27/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/008,228	11/07/2001	Deborah S. Schnur	169.12-0507	6958	
164	7590 01/27/2003				
KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.			EXAMINER		
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING 312 SOUTH THIRD STREET			DOLAN, JEI	DOLAN, JENNIFER M	
MINNEAPOL	IS, MN 55415-1002		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2813		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			- 2/W
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	• •
Advisory Action	10/008,228	SCHNUR ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer M. Dolan	2813	
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio	n appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 December 2002 FAILS TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is require final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	d to avoid abandonment of this ner: (1) a timely filed amendme Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply nt which places the applicat	/ to a tion in
PERIOD F	OR REPLY [check either a) or t	o)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REP 706.07(f).	expire later than SIX MONTHS from to LY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH	he mailing date of the final rejections SOF THE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	period of extension and the correspondate of the shortened statutory period the Office later than three months afte	ding amount of the fee. The appre for reply originally set in the final (opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appearance Ap			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered as $(x,y) = (x,y) + (y,y)$	ered because:		
(a) M they raise new issues that would require	e further consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see	Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applic issues for appeal; and/or	ation in better form for appeal b	by materially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without of	canceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claims	s.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ requapplication in condition for allowance becau		n considered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection		DLELY to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amen explanation of how the new or amended cla			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as for	llows:		
Claim(s) allowed: ADM			•
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.	14		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>12</u> Examiner.	<u>December 2002</u> is a)⊠ appro	oved or b) disapproved I	by the
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure St.	atement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)/	,
10. Other:		Law Shitche	alk
		CARL WHITEHEAD, JR. SUPERVISORY PATERIT EXAM	
S. Patent and Tradamark Office		TECHNOLOGY CENTER 28	WA THE THE PARTY OF THE PARTY O

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The requirements that the 'means for permitting vertical movement' are exposed at the disc opposing face, or that the interface has a disc opposing face have not appeared in the prior version of the claims, and would thus require an additional search..

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant only argues against the rejections in the prior office action in light of the proposed, but not-entered amendment, but does not offer any arguments against the validity of the rejections of the claims in the prior office action.